

Remarks

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 9, 21-24, 26-29, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No: 6,650,742 of *Elliott et al.* ("*Elliott*") and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0016507 of *Karusawa* ("*Karusawa*").

Claims 7-8, 25 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Elliott* and U.S. Patent Application No: 2002/0004800 of *Kikuta et al.* ("*Kikuta*").

Applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 21, and claims 2-6, 9, and 22-24 which depend from amended claims 1 and 21, are not obvious in view of *Elliott* and *Karusawa* because *Elliott* and *Karusawa* do not disclose or suggest identifying a communication channel to a beneficiary of an unwanted communication by examining a content of the unwanted communication as claimed in amended claims 1 and 21. Instead, *Elliott* and *Karusawa* both teach identifying a caller using a caller ID. (*Elliott*, Abstract and col. 4, line 62). (*Karusawa*, "the calling number" in paragraph 0027). *Elliott* and *Karusawa* do not teach or suggest examining a content of an unwanted communication to identify a beneficiary as claimed in amended claims 1 and 21. It is submitted that a caller ID as taught by *Elliott* and *Karusawa* is not the content of an unwanted communication as claimed in amended claims 1 and 21 because the content of an unwanted voice call is the voice message in the unwanted voice call and not a caller ID associated with the unwanted voice call.

It is further submitted that claims 7-8 and 25, which depend from amended claims 1 and 21, are not obvious in view of *Elliott* and *Kikuta* because *Elliott* and *Kikuta* do not disclose

or suggest identifying a communication channel to a beneficiary of an unwanted communication by examining a content of the unwanted communication as claimed in amended claims 1 and 21. Applicant has shown that *Elliott* does not disclose the limitations of amended claims 1 and 21. *Kikuta* discloses an electronic notary system (*Kikuta*, paragraph 0014) rather than identifying a communication channel to a beneficiary of an unwanted communication as claimed in amended claims 1 and 21.

Applicant also submits that amended claim 26, and claims 27-29 and 31 which depend from amended claim 26, are not obvious in view of *Elliott* and *Karusawa* because *Elliott* and *Karusawa* do not disclose or suggest the limitations of amended claim 26 including determining a communication channel to a beneficiary of an unwanted communication by examining a content of the unwanted communication. Applicant has shown that *Elliott* and *Karusawa* do not disclose or suggest determining a communication channel to a beneficiary of an unwanted communication by examining a content of the unwanted communication as claimed in amended claim 26.

It is further submitted that claim 30 which depends from amended claim 26 is not obvious in view of *Elliott* and *Kikuta* because *Elliott* and *Kikuta* do not disclose or suggest determining a communication channel to a beneficiary of an unwanted communication by examining a content of the unwanted communication as claimed in amended claim 26. Appellant has shown that *Elliott* does not disclose the limitations of claim 26. *Kikuta* discloses an electronic notary system (*Kikuta*, paragraph 0014) rather than determining a communication channel to a beneficiary of an unwanted communication by examining a content of the unwanted communication as claimed in amended claim 26.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4-11-06

By: Paul H. Horstmann

Paul H. Horstmann
Reg. No.: 36,167